

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

10/694,074 BELK, NATHAN R.
Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit
BRIAN P. YENKE 2622
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
Status
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>RCE/Amendment (02/19/2008)</u> .
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10,11,26 and 27</u> is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>all the above</u> is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
See the attached detailed Onice action for a list of the certified copies not received.
Attachment(s)
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/19/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner notes that newly cited, US 7,187913 discloses a prefiltering operation, in addition

to previously cited, US 6,118,499, US 5,737,035, US 6,297,858, US 7,006,162 and US 6,931,083.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Birleson et al., US 6,177,964 in view of Fulga et al., US 7,196,737.

In considering claims 1, 8, 11 and 26,

Birleson discloses a single integrated tuner circuit, which includes a filter 101, filter 109 and filter 113 being part of the tuning circuit (Fig 1). It is noted regarding the dissipating the undesired channels from being sent to the transmitter is a function of placing the filter on the tuner chip—which is stated in the applicant's specification. Birleson discloses that filter 101 in the invention is used to retrieve all TV signals wherein Prior Art the use of a filter to filter some of the channels is traditionally used (col 7, line 56-61). Thus, by simply replacing the filter 101 of Birleson with the conventional filter, would render obvious the pending claims. The use of a filter to receive more frequencies/channels or less frequencies/channels are obvious modifications to one of ordinary skill in the art (as evidenced by the prior art) and thus are not patentable.

The examiner has incorporated Fulga, US 7,196,737 which discloses that in prior art (Fig 1) it was known to utilize in a system a prefilter (101 Fig 1) which received a 1st number of channels and provided a few channels to the tuner 140. It is also a general principle that the lesser number of channels (which correlates to a smaller frequency band) also reduces the susceptibility/problems with spurious noise from unwanted channels/bands. It also appears that Fulga's description of the Prior Art (Fig 1) pertains to the previously cited Birleson reference as used herein.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Birleson which discloses a single integrated tuner circuit, by recognizing that a prefilter could be used to limit the number of channels/frequencies entering the tuner circuit as disclosed by Fulga for the known advantages as stated above.

In considering claim 2,

Although the combination of Birleson/Fulga may not explicitly recite the number of channels of the 1st/2nd/3rd as claimed, the concept of filtering/tuning down the number of channels received has been evidenced above, and the the specific number of such is not considered patentable since the result is predictable (i.e. no unexpected results are derived from a filter design to filter out a select band of channels).

In considering claims 3-6,

Birleson/Fulga discloses the reception of over the air and cable broadcast, which meets the plurality of bands of channels, wherein conventional UHF/VHF systems provide the switching being bands of channels, including a plurality of capacitors/inductor as claimed, thus the examiner takes "OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding such, in the event the applicant disagrees/traverses such notice, the examiner notes applicant's cited EP-1345324.

In considering claims 7 and 27,

Birleson discloses receiving a TV signal in the frequency range of 55MHz-806Mhz which is in the range as claimed (48Mhz-852Mhz).

In considering claim 10,

Birleson does not explicitly recite the use of a LPF, however the use of such in order to attenuate a frequency range are conventional in the art, by the very definition of such filters, thus the examiner takes "OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding a LPF being used on an input signal.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Yenke whose telephone number is (571)272-7359. The examiner work schedule is Monday-Thursday, 0730-1830 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor,

David L. Ometz, can be reached at (571)272-7593.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571)-273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is

(703)305-HELP.

General information about patents, trademarks, products and services offered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and other related information is available by contacting the USPTO's General Information Services Division at:

800-PTO-9199 or 703-308-HELP

(FAX) 703-305-7786

(TDD) 703-305-7785

An automated message system is available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day providing informational responses to frequently asked questions and the ability to order certain documents. Customer service representatives are available to answer questions, send materials or connect customers with other offices of the USPTO from 8:30 a.m. - 8:00p.m. EST/EDT, Monday-Friday excluding federal holidays.

For other technical patent information needs, the Patent Assistance Center can be reached through customer service representatives at the above numbers, Monday through Friday (except federal holidays) from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST/EDT.

The Patent Electronic Business Center (EBC) allows USPTO customers to retrieve data, check the status of pending actions, and submit information and applications. The tools currently available in the Patent EBC are Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) and the Electronic Filing System (EFS). PAIR (http://pair.uspto.gov) provides customers direct secure access to their own patent application status information, as well as to general patent information publicly available. EFS allows customers to electronically file patent application documents securely via the Internet. EFS is a system for submitting new utility patent applications and pre-grant publication submissions in electronic publication-ready form. EFS includes software to help customers prepare submissions in extensible Markup Language (XML) format and to assemble the various parts of the application as an electronic submission package. EFS also allows the submission of Computer Readable Format

(CRF) sequence listings for pending biotechnology patent applications, which were filed in paper form.

/BRIAN P. YENKE/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622

B.P.Y 24 March 2008